



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Of the Peculiarities of the Pastoral Epistles.

BY REV. M. J. CRAMER.

THE Pastoral Epistles form one of the most difficult problems in Isagogical and Exegetical Theology. This is evident, first, from the fact that so many theologians, eminent alike for their profound scholarship, patient research, and critical skill, have arrived at different conclusions in reference to their authorship, the time and place of their composition, their style and contents; and, secondly, from the existence of an immense literature on the subject. Certain it is, that they contain many important passages in regard to the doctrine of the Person of Christ, His redemptive and mediatorial work and office, the Inspiration of the Sacred Scriptures, the Fall and Redemption of Man, Regeneration, etc. Nor is it to be overlooked, that, besides many practical suggestions as to personal piety and Church-discipline, they afford us a deep insight not only into the intimate personal relations that existed between the great Apostle of the Gentiles and his co-laborers, but into the state and condition of the Apostolic Church as well. The simplicity of the latter forms a striking contrast to the complex constitution and preposterous assumptions of the Roman Catholic Church.

And yet the genuineness of these Epistles has been repeatedly and severely assailed, especially in modern times. Schleiermacher¹ opened the attack by declaring the first Epistle to Timothy to be a miserable compilation of the other two; while Eichhorn,² De Wette,³ and F. C. Baur⁴ maintained that all three Epistles are historically and exegetically incomprehensible; and a host of smaller critics followed in their footsteps. De Wette, however, admitted that they are as well attested by external or historical evidences as the other Epistles of St. Paul. Among the strongest living opponents to their

¹ Ueber den Sogenannten ersten Brief an Timotheus (1807).

² Einleitung in das Neue Testament (1824-27).

³ Lehrbuch der Histor. Krit. Einleitung in die Kanonischen Bücher des Neuen Testaments (1826-47).

⁴ Die Sogenannten Pastoral Briefe des Apostel's Paulus (1835); and: Paulus der Apostel Jesu Christi (1845-66).

genuineness are Prof. Pfeiderer,¹ of Berlin, and Prof. Holtzmann,² of Strassburg. The former asserts that the "doctrinal tendency" of the Pastoral Epistles "is very different" from that of Paul's acknowledged Epistles; while the latter's book is the most elaborate work against their genuineness. True, there have not been wanting many strong and able defenders of their genuineness. Among them may be mentioned Bleek,³ M. Baumgarten,⁴ Wiesinger,⁵ Heydenreich,⁶ Matthies,⁷ Wieseler,⁸ Van Oosterzee,⁹ Guericke,¹⁰ Reuss,¹¹ Huther,¹² Conybeare and Howson,¹³ Farrar,¹⁴ Lewin,¹⁵ Wace,¹⁶ Whedon,¹⁷ Plumptre,¹⁸ Fairbairn,¹⁹ Alford,²⁰ Von Hofmann,²¹ J. P. Lange, Beck, Herzog, Gloag, Kolling,²² and others; while still others, like Prof. Scharling,²³ of Copenhagen, leave the subject undecided, not being able, as honest seekers after truth, to see their way through all the difficulties that surround these Epistles. Some of the opponents, as Prof. Pfeiderer and M. Renan,²⁴ feel forced to admit some parts of gen-

¹ Paulinismus, and: Protestanten-Bibel (1874).

² Die Pastoral-Briefe kritisch und exegetisch behandelt (Leipzig, 1880-85).

³ Introduction to the New Testament. (English Translation: T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh.)

⁴ Die Aechtheit der Pastoral-Briefe.

⁵ Biblical Commentary on the New Testament (in connection with the work of Olshausen. English Translation, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark.)

⁶ Die Pastoral-Briefe Pauli erklärt.

⁷ Erklärung der Pastoralbriefe.

⁸ Chronologie des Apostolischen Zeitalters.

⁹ In J. P. Lange's "Bible-Work," N. T., Engl. Transl. (edited by Dr. Schaff).

¹⁰ Neutestamentliche Isagogik.

¹¹ Die Geschichte der Heil. Schriften des N. T. — In his later deliverances (Les Epitres Pauliniennes, 1878), Reuss rejects 1 Timothy and Titus, but admits 2 Timothy, assigning it to Paul's *first* Roman captivity.

¹² In Meyer's Krit.-Exeg. Commentar über das N. T.

¹³ The Life and Epistles of the Apostle Paul.

¹⁴ The Life and Work of St. Paul (2 vols.).

¹⁵ The Life and Epistles of St. Paul (2 vols.).

¹⁶ In Speaker's Commentary, N. T., Vol. III., 1881.

¹⁷ Commentary on the N. T., Vol. IV. (New York: Phillips & Hunt.)

¹⁸ In Schaff's Pop. Com. on the N. T., Vol. III., 1881. Also: Schaff's Apost. Church, Book IV., chap. 3.

¹⁹ Pastoral Epistles, 1874.

²⁰ Greek N. T., with Notes.

²¹ Com. zu d. Hl. Schriften d. N. T.

²² Der Erste Brief an Tim. (1882).

²³ Die Neuesten Untersuchungen über die Sog. Past. Briefe d. N. T's. (German Transl.).

²⁴ L'Eglise Chrétienne.

uine Pauline Epistles, or notes, and thus they break the force of their opposition.¹

It is not proposed in this essay to remove these difficulties, nor even to examine the external or purely historical evidences in favor of the genuineness of the Pastoral Epistles. To do so would require more time and space than we have at our command. A brief examination of their doctrinal contents, of the Constitution of the Apostolic Church as presupposed by them, of the allusion to heresy, and of the linguistic peculiarities found in them, is all that is attempted.

I. Let us, then, first, briefly examine THE DOCTRINAL CONTENTS OF THE PASTORAL EPISTLES, and see how far, or rather, how near, they correspond with the teachings of St. Paul, as found in his acknowledged Epistles.

HISTORICAL NOTICES.

A careful and unbiased student of the Pastoral Epistles can scarcely fail to notice that they bear the impress of St. Paul's mind. Not only does his name stand at the beginning of the three Epistles (Παῦλος Ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ), but repeated references are found in the context to the Gospel committed to his trust (1 Tim. ii. 11; ii. 7; 2 Tim. ii. 8; iv. 17; Tit. i. 3; cf. Rom. i. 16; xvi. 25); to facts in his life, such as having persecuted the Church (1 Tim. i. 13); to his conversion (1 Tim. i. 13-16); to his persecutions and afflictions at Antioch, Iconium, and Lystra (2 Tim. iii. 11); to his acquaintance with Timothy's family (2 Tim. i. 5); to his many fellow-laborers (*Demas*, 2 Tim. iv. 10; cf. Col. iv. 14; Philem. 24; *Tychicus*, 2 Tim. iv. 12; Tit. iii. 12; cf. Acts xx. 4; Ephes. vi. 21; Col. iv. 7; *Luke*, 2 Tim. iv. 11; cf. Acts xvi. 10; xx. 5; xxi. 18; Col. iv. 14; Philem. 24; *Mark*, 2 Tim. iv. 11; cf. Col. iv. 10; Philem. 13; *Aquila* and *Priscilla*, 2 Tim. iv. 19; cf. Acts xviii. 2; Rom. xvi. 3; 1 Cor. xvi. 19; *Erastus*, 2 Tim. iv. 20; cf. Acts xix. 22; Rom. xvi. 23; *Trophimus*, 2 Tim. iv. 20; cf. Acts xx. 4; xxi. 29; *Apollos*, Tit. iii. 13; cf. Acts xviii. 24; xix. 1; 1 Cor. i. 12; iii. 6-12; xvi. 12); to the Churches he founded in Ephesus (2 Tim. i. 17; iv. 12), in Thessalonica (2 Tim. iv. 10), in Galatia (2 Tim. iv. 10), in Corinth (2 Tim. iv. 20), in Troas (2 Tim. iv. 13); and to his imprisonment and defence at Rome (2 Tim. iv. 6-8, 16, 17).

Upon this historical background the doctrinal system of the Pasto-

¹ Schaff's H. of C. C., Vol. I. p. 808.

ral Epistles rises to view. True, it does not appear as complete as in the more elaborate Epistles of the great Apostle ; yet a close examination of it will reveal the Pauline method and mind. The starting point is

THE FALLEN AND DEPRAVED CONDITION OF MAN.

All men are sinners, and, therefore, stand in need of salvation through the mercy of God our Saviour (1 Tim. ii. 4). They are foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving diverse lusts and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful and hating one another (πλανώμενοι, ἀνόητοι, ἀπειθεῖς, ἐπιθυμίαι καὶ ἡδοναὶ ποικίλαι, κοσμικαὶ ἐπιθυμίαι, ἐν κακίᾳ καὶ φθόνῳ διάγοντες, στυγητοί, μισοῦντες ἀλλήλους, Tit. ii. 12 ; iii. 2, 3). Nor is this all : they are unto every good work reprobate (πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἀδόκιμοι), and therefore exposed to destruction and perdition (ὄλεθρος καὶ ἀπωλεία, Tit. i. 16 ; 1 Tim. vi. 9 ; cf. 2 Thess. i. 9 ; ii. 3 ; Rom. ix. 22). In this sad condition not only the Gentiles are found, but the Jews as well (καὶ ἡμεῖς, etc., Tit. iii. 3), who profess to know God, but in their works deny him (Tit. i. 16 ; cf. Rom. ii. 17, 24), and who, notwithstanding their zeal for the law (1 Tim. i. 7 ; cf. Rom. x. 2), are abominable and disobedient (βδελυκτοὶ καὶ ἀπειθεῖς, Tit. i. 16). Does not this brief delineation of man's sinful state forcibly remind us of the awful picture drawn by the same hand in the first and second chapters of the Epistle to the Romans? Is not a similarity of thought and expression perceptible?

OF GOD'S PURPOSE TO SAVE MAN.

But just as sin and death are universal (1 Tim. i. 16 ; cf. Rom. v. 12 ; 1 Cor. xv. 21 ; Ephes. iv. 18), so, too, are salvation from sin (σωτηρία) and eternal life (ζωὴ αἰώνιος), which God has provided for man ; wherefore He is called *Saviour* (Σωτήρ, 1 Tim. i. 1 ; ii. 3 ; iv. 10 ; Tit. ii. 10 ; iii. 4),—a name which, as applied to God the Father, is not found in the other Epistles of St. Paul ;¹ but as applied to Jesus Christ, it is found in Acts xiii. 22 ; Ephes. v. 23 ; Phil. iii. 20 ; 2 Tim. i. 10 ; Tit. i. 4 ; ii. 13 ; iii. 6. According to His own

¹ The name Σωτήρ, as applied to God the Father, is found, besides the passages referred to, in but two other places in the New Testament, viz., in Luke i. 47, and in Jud. 5, 25. In the Septuagint it is found in Psalm xxiv. 5, and in Isaiah xii. 2 ; xiv. 15. It is obvious that this name is applied to the Father in view of what he has done, through Christ, for the salvation of mankind. (See 2 Cor. v. 19.)

purpose and grace (κατ' ἰδίαν πρόθεσιν καὶ χάριν, 2 Tim. i. 9; cf. Rom. viii. 28-30; Ephes. i. 11; κατὰ τὸ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος, Tit. iii. 5), and before the world began (πρὸ χρόνων αἰώνιων, 2 Tim. i. 9), God willed that all men should be saved (πάντας ἀνθρώπους θέλει σωθῆναι, 1 Tim. i. 15; ii. 4; ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ σωτήριος πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις, Tit. ii. 11; ὅς ἐστί σωτήρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων, 1 Tim. iv. 10),—a purpose that will be realized only in the elect (ἐκλεκτοί, 2 Tim. ii. 10, Tit. i. 1), or in those called with a holy calling, *i.e.*, in true believers (2 Tim. i. 9; iii. 8). This gracious purpose, originally kept secret (a μυστήριον ἀποκεκρυμμένον, or σεσιγημένον, Rom. xvi. 25; Ephes. iii. 9; Col. i. 26), was made manifest by the appearing of our Saviour, Jesus Christ (φανερωθεῖσαν διὰ τῆς ἐπιφανείας τοῦ σωτήρος, etc., 2 Tim. i. 10; Tit. ii. 11; iii. 4), who came into the world (ἦλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον, 1 Tim. i. 15) to save sinners, wherefore He is called our Saviour (Σωτήρ, 2 Tim. i. 10; Tit. i. 4; iii. 6). That He is *God*, is evident from the expressions: ἦλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον, and Θεός¹ ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί (1 Tim. iii. 16); and that He is at the same time *Man*, is equally evident from the expression: ἄνθρωπος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός (1 Tim. ii. 5; cf. Rom. v. 15; 1 Cor. v. 15; Phil. ii. 7). As the only Mediator between God and man (εἰς μεσίτης Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, 1 Tim. ii. 5; cf. Gal. iii. 19, 20), sprung from the seed of David (2 Tim. ii. 8; cf. Rom. i. 3), He procured our salvation by giving Himself for us (ὃς ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπερ ἡμῶν, Tit. ii. 14; cf. Rom. viii. 23, Gal. ii. 20; Ephes. v. 2, 25); and, therefore, He, as the Χριστὸς ἐσταυρωμένος, forms the λόγος of all Gospel-preaching (1 Cor. i. 17, 18, 23). And since death is the penalty of man's sin, the object of Christ's death can have been no other than, by voluntarily taking upon Himself man's guilt and by voluntarily suffering the penalty in his stead, to abolish death, and to bring life and immortality to light (καταργήσαντος τὸν θάνατον, φωτίσαντος ζωὴν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν, 2 Tim. i. 10). The believer has already on earth laid hold on eternal life (1 Tim. vi. 12, 19; Tit. ii. 12); but he will inherit it as the perfect fulfilment of the σωτηρία in God's heavenly kingdom. Hence, here he is an heir according to the hope of eter-

¹ Even if in this passage the reading *ὁς*, instead of *Θεός*, be adopted, as is done by Tischendorf, Tregelles, Westcott and Hort, and by the Revisers of the Authorized Version, the deep, dogmatic significance of the passage remains unimpaired. Nor does the proof for the Incarnation of Christ depend upon this passage. The passage in John i. 14 is quite as strong a proof as this one; and the declarations in Col. i. 19, and ii. 9, imply that the whole nature and attributes of God are in the person of Jesus Christ, and that really, essentially, or substantially, and personally, so that the same person who is man is God also, but in human form.

nal life (κληρονόμος κατ' ἐλπίδα ζωῆς αἰωνίου, Tit. iii. 7), — an expression based upon the Pauline view of adoption. The final taking possession of eternal life, which will take place in that day (ἐν ἐκείνῃ ἡμέρᾳ, 2 Tim. i. 22, 18; iv. 8; cf. 3 Thess. i. 10), that is, at the appearing of Christ (ἐπιφάνεια, Tit. ii. 13; 1 Tim. vi. 14; 2 Tim. iv. 1), — the Judge of the living and the dead (2 Tim. iv. 1; cf. 1 Thess. iv. 16, 17; 1 Cor. xv. 51; Acts viii. 4), — will be connected with eternal glory (2 Tim. ii. 10) and with a share in His reign (συμβασιλεύομεν, 2 Tim. ii. 12; cf. Rom. v. 17).

OF JUSTIFICATION.

Now, in so far as Christ has freed us from the guilt of sin and the fear of death, he has paid a ransom for us (ἀντίλυτρον, 1 Tim. ii. 6 : λυτροῦν), — an expression that reminds us forcibly of Paul's conception of the ἀπολύτρωσις (Ephes. i. 7; Col. i. 14). In virtue of this ransom having been paid for us, we may be justified by God's grace (δικαιούσθαι, Tit. iii. 7); so that here, too, we meet with the Pauline doctrine of δικαίωσις in the forensic meaning of the term (Rom. iv. 25; v. 18; ii. 13; iii. 20, 24, 26; Gal. ii. 16, 17; iii. 8, 11, 24; v. 4). But the condition upon which we may obtain δικαιοσύνη and σωτηρία, is not the merit of our good works (οὐ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα, 2 Tim. i. 9; οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων τῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ ὧν ἐποιήσαμεν ἡμεῖς, Tit. iii. 5), but faith only (1 Tim. i. 14, 16, 19; ii. 15; iii. 13; iv. 10; cf. Rom. v. 1; iv. 5, 13, 16; Ephes. ii. 5, 8, 9); wherefore Christianity appears in the light of a Divine Dispensation (unto Salvation) which is in faith (οἰκονομία¹ θεοῦ ἐν πίστει, 1 Tim. i. 4). The reason why the doctrine of Justification by Faith alone, and not by works, does not occupy as prominent a place in these Epistles as in those to the Romans and Galatians, may be found in the fact, that those to whom they were addressed were not so "zealous of the law," as to require the Apostle's warning and corrective voice. But here, also, notwithstanding that warning voice is raised against other errors and abuses, the central position of faith in the system of Christian doctrines is maintained with all the strength of a profound conviction.

OF REGENERATION.

Justification and Regeneration, though taking place at one and the same time, are nevertheless logically separate and distinct. This

¹ Tischendorf, Tregelles, Westcott and Hort, and the Revisers of the Authorized Version adopt the reading *οἰκονομία* in preference to *οικοδομία* of the Textus Receptus. For a statement of their reasons, vid. their resp. editions of the Greek New Test. *in loco*.

logical distinction is apparent not only in the other Pauline Epistles, but in the ones under consideration as well. Being justified by God's grace (Tit. iii. 7), we are saved by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost, which He shed on us (διὰ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας καὶ ἀνακαινώσεως Πνεύματος Ἁγίου, Tit. iii. 5, 6). The words λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας have by many commentators been interpreted in an arbitrary manner, in that they maintained that λουτρόν, being a figurative expression for baptism, is regeneration itself, or at least the direct cause of it. That this is a forced, and, hence, a wrong interpretation, is evident from the fact, that in the Apostolic Church persons were baptized *after* they had made a profession of faith (Mark xvi. 16; Acts ii. 41), and *after* they had received the gift of the Holy Ghost, that is, *after* they had been regenerated (Acts ix. 17, 18; x. 44-48). And that baptism, in itself, is not regeneration, nor the direct cause of it, is further evident from the fact, that Simon, of Samaria, believed the preaching of Philip and *was baptized*; but neither was his faith *saving* faith, nor did his baptism produce the regeneration of his soul, for he was still "in the gall of bitterness, and in the bond of iniquity" (Acts viii. 9-24). The whole expression: διὰ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας καὶ ἀνακαινώσεως Πνεύματος Ἁγίου (λουτρόν being derived from the verb λούειν = *to wash, to cleanse*, metaph., to render pure, namely from sin, *i.e.*, to deliver from its consequences, Rev. i. 5), — the genitive in both expressions being that of the efficient cause, — may, therefore, be interpreted thus: As by means of the bath the body is cleansed from impurities, so the soul, through the λουτρόν of regeneration, effected by the Holy Spirit, is saved and cleansed from sin and guilt. The λουτρόν παλιγγενεσίας, — being the *means* of regeneration, — denotes the decisive act, the great starting-point in the history of the sinner's inner and outer new life, while the ἀνακαινώσις Πνεύματος Ἁγίου indicates the further progress and development of that new life.¹ Παλιγγενεσία is always accompanied by an outpouring, upon the soul, of the Holy Spirit (Tit. iii. 5, 6), — a view that is apparent in all the undisputed Epistles of St. Paul. True, the word παλιγγενεσία is found in no other Epistle;² yet the great fact, namely, the introduction into the soul of a new life-giving principle, is mentioned by him in other terms, such as ζωοποιεῖν (Rom. iv. 17; viii. 11; 1 Cor. xv. 36; 2 Cor. iii. 6), and ἐγείρειν

¹ Vid. Cremer's Bibl.-Theol. Lexicon of New Testament Greek (Engl. Transl.): articles λούω and λουτρόν. Also, Van Oosterzee's Com'try to the Past. Epistles (in Lange's Bible-Work, Engl. Transl.), chap. iii. 1-11.

² It is found but once more in the New Testament, and that in Matt. xix. 28.

(Ephes. ii. 5, 6 ; cf. Rom. iv. 6-10), *καινή κτίσις* (2 Cor. v. 17), *ἀνακαίνωσις τοῦ νοῦς* (Rom. xii. 2 ; 2 Cor. iv. 16 ; Col. iii. 10). Having been regenerated by the power of the Holy Spirit, we thus become righteous (*δίκαιος*, 1 Tim. i. 9 ; Tit. i. 8 ; cf. Ephes. v. 9), and the power and grace of God (2 Tim. i. 8 ; Tit. ii. 11), as revealed in the inspired Scriptures (2 Tim. iii. 16), lead us to live soberly, righteously, and godly (*σοφρόνως καὶ δικαίως καὶ εὐσεβῶς*, Tit. ii. 12), as it becomes the saints (1 Tim. v. 10).

OF GOOD WORKS.

It has been urged as an objection against their genuineness, that the Pastoral Epistles lay more stress upon good works than the other writings of St. Paul's. But its validity cannot be sustained by a comparison of the teachings of the two classes of Epistles on this subject. The godly (*εὐσεβής*) life of the regenerated person, according to the Pastoral Epistles, manifests itself in good works (1 Tim. vi. 11, 12, 18 ; 2 Tim. ii. 21 ; Tit. i. 16 ; iii. 14). These the Apostle Paul calls elsewhere the fruits of the Spirit (Gal. v. 22 ; Ephes. v. 9), the fruits of righteousness (Phil. i. 11), the fruits unto holiness (Rom. v. 22), — the result of faith that *worketh* by love (Gal. v. 6). True, while he attaches nowhere a saving merit to them, he everywhere insists upon their performance as an evidence of a godly life, especially in our Epistles, because of false teachers, whose lives were anything but holy (1 Tim. iv. 2 ; vi. 4, 5 ; 2 Tim. ii. 16 ; iii. 2, 5 ; Tit. i. 11, 16).

Aside from this, there is nothing in the Pastoral Epistles, that is at all strange to the well-known doctrinal conceptions of St. Paul. The requirement, that Christians should be prepared for every good work (*πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἡτοιμασμένον*, 2 Tim. ii. 21 ; iii. 17 ; Tit. iii. 1 ; cf. 2 Cor. ix. 8) ; yea, be zealous of good works (*ζήλωτής καλῶν ἔργων*, Tit. ii. 14), and that the preacher be a pattern of good works (*τύπον καλῶν ἔργων*, Tit. ii. 7), is in entire conformity with the Apostle's teachings in his other Epistles. And when it is said, that godliness with contentment is great gain (*πορισμὸς μέγας*, 1 Tim. vi. 6), it is by no means intended thereby to deviate from the doctrine of *σωτηρία ἐκ χάριτος* ; for the gain is a promise of a *future* reward as well as of a present one (1 Tim. iv. 8).

So, too, there is no contradiction between what is said of woman in 1 Tim. ii. 15 and in 1 Cor. vii. If the former passage declares that she shall obtain *σωτηρία* by fulfilling her specific calling (*διὰ τῆς τεκνογονίας*), it also specifies immediately thereafter the other indispensable condition of this *σώζεσθαι*, namely, a continuance in faith,

and charity, and holiness, with sobriety ;— a requirement that is in perfect harmony with the teachings of 1 Cor. vii.

On the other hand, it may at first sight appear somewhat strange in the Apostle Paul to declare here, that the rich, by being rich in good works, are treasuring up for themselves a good foundation against the time to come (*ἀποθησαυρίζοντες ἑαυτοῖς καλὸν θεμέλιον*, 1 Tim. vi. 18, 19) ; and that those who have discharged the duties of a deacon well, acquire for themselves a good degree (*βαθμὸν ἑαυτοῖς καλὸν περιποιῶνται*, 1 Tim. iii. 13).¹ And yet, rightly interpreted, these passages are no more opposed to the Pauline doctrine of *σωτηρία ἐκ χάριτος*, than Rom. ii. 6–8 ; 1 Cor. iii. 8 ; 2 Cor. v. 10 ; or than to Christ's saying in Luke xvi. 9–16, and in Matt. vi. 24.

THE GOSPEL — A DOCTRINE.

A striking and much-discussed point in the Pastoral Epistles is, that in them the Gospel, or Christianity, is spoken of as a *Doctrine*, which is of God (*διδασκαλία ἡ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ*, 1 Tim. iv. 6 ; vi. 1–3 ; Tit. ii. 10), and is preached by his servants (1 Tim. iv. 13–16 ; v. 17 ; 2 Tim. ii. 2 ; iii. 10), who for that reason are called *κῆρυκες* (1 Tim. ii. 7 ; 2 Tim. i. 11 ; iv. 17), and *μάρτυρες* and *διδάσκαλοι* (2 Tim. i. 11 ; iv. 2), and *εὐαγγελισταί* (2 Tim. iv. 5). As opposed to the morbid (1 Tim. vi. 4) and irrational (1 Tim. i. 6, 7 ; iv. 1 ; 2 Tim. iii. 8, 9 ; Tit. i. 10–14), heterodoxy (*ἐτεροδιδασκαλεῖν*, 1 Tim. i. 3 ; iv. 3), the Gospel of Christ is the sound doctrine (*ἡ ὑγιαίνουσα διδασκαλία*, 1 Tim. i. 10 ; 2 Tim. iv. 3 ; Tit. i. 9 ; ii. 1), the godly doctrine (*εὐσεβεια διδασκαλία*, 1 Tim. vi. 3), the form of sound words (*ὑποτύπωσις ὑγιαίνόντων λόγων*, 2 Tim. i. 13), sound speech (*λύγος ὑγιής*, Tit. ii. 8), — expressions which, in their metaphorical sense, are nowhere else found in the New Testament. The content of this Doctrine is the Word of God (*ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ* = *θεοῦ*, Tit. i. 3 ; ii. 5 ; 2 Tim. ii. 9), sometimes called simply the word of truth, or the truth (*ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀληθείας*, 2 Tim. ii. 15 ; iv. 2 ; iii. 8 ; iv. 4 ; Tit. i. 14). Now, if the Gospel be conceived as a *Doctrine*, it is clear, that its acceptance implies that it is to be learned (2 Tim. iii. 14), and that it thus becomes the knowledge of the truth (*ἐπίγνωσις ἀληθείας*, 1 Tim. ii. 4 ; 2 Tim. ii. 25 ; iii. 7 ; Tit. i. 1), or the knowledge of God

¹ This is not the place to give an extended exegesis of these passages. The reader is referred, among other commentators, to Alford's Greek N. T. with Notes ; Van Oosterzee, in Lange's Bible-Work, Huther, in Meyer's Com't'y ; Schaff's and Speaker's Com't'ries, *in loco*.

(εἰδέναι θεόν, Tit. i. 16 ; 2 Tim. iii. 15). But this knowledge must always be accompanied by faith ; for Πίστις and the knowledge of the Ἀλήθεια are inseparable (1 Tim. ii. 7 ; iv. 6-8). And faith in turn must rest upon a pure conscience (καθαρᾶ συνειδήσει, 1 Tim. iii. 9 ; 2 Tim. i. 3 ; 1 Tim. i. 5, 19). But where the conscience is pure, the faith is also sound (Tit. i. 15 ; ii. 2) ; and where the conscience is seared by sin and hypocrisy, there faith becomes shipwrecked (1 Tim. i. 19), or degenerates into vain jangling (ματαιλογίαν, 1 Tim. i. 6 ; iv. 7 ; Tit. i. 10). Thus Christian knowledge and Christian faith and purity of heart are so closely related, that, where the latter is soiled by sin, there the other two must necessarily also suffer injury (1 Tim. vi. 10). Therefore, the Pastoral Epistles clearly teach, what St. Paul has set forth in his other Epistles, namely, that a holy life is as necessary as sound doctrine, and *vice versa* ; that is, the heart must be right as well as the head.

Now, if the question be asked : Why did the Apostle Paul, in these Epistles, set forth the Gospel of Christ in the form of a sound and godly Doctrine ? it may be replied, that the errors, both in doctrine and practice, that had crept into the churches, of which Timothy and Titus had the charge, no doubt led him to do so. He knew that these errors originated with men corrupt in mind and heart, destitute of the truth (ἄνθρωποι διεφθαρμένοι τὸν νοῦν καὶ ἀπεστερημένοι τῆς ἀληθείας, 1 Tim. vi. 5 ; 2 Tim. iii. 8), given to all kinds of excesses (1 Tim. iv. 1-3 ; 2 Tim. iii. 2-4 ; Tit. i. 11, 16), and hence, lacking godliness (ἀσέβεια, 2 Tim. ii. 16). Toward such deceivers he could pursue but one course, namely, by pointing out the inseparable union of sound doctrine and sound morals, to insist on the acceptance of the one and the practice of the other, and thus to put a stop to their mischievous agitation.

While we fully admit, in the Pastoral Epistles, a perceptible deviation from the method adopted by St. Paul in the composition of his other Epistles, we feel at the same time constrained to maintain, that a careful examination of the two classes of Epistles will show that both have sprung from the same mind, and that this deviation is due rather to the circumstances that led to their composition, than to a change in the Apostle's sentiments or convictions.

II. *We come now to consider, briefly, in the second place, THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH AND HER CONSTITUTION, as developed in the Pastoral Epistles.*

It has been urged as an objection against their genuineness, that they

presuppose the Constitution of the Apostolic Church to have been in a far more complete state of development than there is any reason for assuming it to have in reality been, and that they lay greater stress upon a rigid administration of Church-discipline, than the other Pauline Epistles. Now, even if we admit the validity of this objection, which we do not, it must be remembered, that these Epistles were addressed to comparatively young ministers, who, though being overseers (*ἐπίσκοποι*), or pastors, had as yet little experience in organizing churches and administering Church-discipline. Hence they stood in need of spiritual instruction as to the mode of procedure. And who was better qualified to give such instruction than the great Apostle who had founded and organized so many churches? Again, it is now generally admitted, that these Epistles were written toward the close of his life. May it not, therefore, be reasonably inferred, that the Constitution of the Apostolic Church had at that time passed far beyond the first stage in its development? True, it may not have existed in an elaborated or complete form; but whatever its form may have been, it was, doubtless, based upon a verbal, but sufficiently definite agreement among the Apostolic College and the Mother-Church at Jerusalem, embodying the principles of church-government laid down by Christ Himself, as well as the results obtained from experience in organizing and governing individual churches. But though there may have been such an agreement, we are by no means justified by the Acts or the Epistles of the Apostles in inferring, that it was rigid or inflexible in its nature and operation, or *hierarchical* in its tendency. On the contrary, the whole tenor of the Apostolic writings shows that much liberty was taken in introducing such modifications as the times and circumstances might require. Thus, for example, the churches founded in pagan cities, departed without scruple from the Jewish customs and practices. They felt themselves under no obligation to adopt, for the sake of preserving the agreement or Constitution intact, the same form of Jewish worship in all its particulars as was observed by the Church at Jerusalem. But these minor differences, arising from the perfect law of liberty, did not prevent the existence of a substantial agreement both as to faith and practice. A proof for the existence of such an agreement may be found in the generous contributions made by the churches in Asia Minor and Greece to the suffering churches in Palestine, and especially to the Mother-Church at Jerusalem.

Thus, the Constitution of the Apostolic Church, — if, in the proper

sense of the word, it was a Constitution,—was neither *elaborate* and *inflexible* in its form, granting to but few arbitrary power over the people of God ; nor *loose* and *latitudinarian* in its application, allowing to each individual Church the fullest liberty of faith and practice in respect of the ceremonial law ; but a *spiritual bond*, based upon a common faith and a holy life, as well as upon the principles laid down by Christ Himself, exercising no constraint but that of Christian love and truth, and granting to each Church the right, consistent with the common faith, to manage its own affairs. We cannot but believe, that a full elaboration of the views here presented, and based, as we claim them to be, upon the Apostolic Writings, would weaken, if not destroy, the force of the objection against the genuineness of the Pastoral Epistles mentioned at the beginning of this part of this essay.¹

After these preliminary remarks, let us examine these Epistles a little more closely for the purpose of ascertaining more fully what they teach concerning the Church and its Constitution. And, first, as to —

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH.

The Church of the living God (ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ ζώντος . . . τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, 1 Tim. iii. 15 ; cf. Acts xx. 28 ; 1 Cor. i. 1) is founded by and upon God (θεμέλιος Θεοῦ, 2 Tim. ii. 19 ; cf. Ephes. ii. 20). She is also called the pillar and ground (foundation) of the truth (2 Tim. iii. 15), the house of God (οἶκος Θεοῦ, 1 Tim. iii. 15 ; cf. Hebr. iii. 6), in which He is Lord (δησπότης, 2 Tim. ii. 21), and the ministers are his stewards (οἰκονόμοι Θεοῦ, Tit. i. 7 ; cf. 1 Cor. iv. 1 ; ix. 17). She is composed of true Christians, though bad persons and hypocrites are sometimes found within her pale ; or, to use the Apostle's figure, vessels of honor and vessels of dishonor (σκεύη εἰς τιμὴν καὶ σκεύη ἀτιμίας, 2 Tim. ii. 20, 21 ; cf. 1 Cor. i. 29 ; v. 1, 2 ; Matt. vii. 21). But whether one belongs to the one or the other of these classes, does not depend so much upon a "*Decretum absolutum Dei*," as upon one's own volition and conduct (1 Tim. i. 12, 13 ; ii. 4) ; for all are called with a holy calling (καλέσαντος κλήσει ἁγία, 2 Tim. i. 9 ; cf. Matt. xii. 16) to be His own people (περιούσιος λαός,

¹ For a full and learned discussion of this subject, *vide* Schaff's History of the Apostolic Church ; also, his History of the Chr. Church ; also : Pressense's Early Years of Christianity, and, Christian Life and Practice in the Early Church ; also : Neander's History of the Planting of the Chr. Church.

Tit. ii. 14 ; cf. 1 Pet. ii. 9), or to be saints (κλητοὶ ἅγιοι, Rom. i. 7 ; 1 Cor. i. 2 ; 2 Cor. i. 1 ; Ephes. i. 1 ; Col. i. 2, 4, 12, 24), in order thereby to constitute the communion of saints, that is, the Christian Church.

The Church spoken of in these Epistles is represented as being under the immediate guidance of the Apostles, who, through the will of God (διὰ θελήματος Θεοῦ, 1 Tim. i. 1 ; 2 Tim. i. 1 ; Ephes. i. 1 ; Col. i. 1 ; 2 Cor. i. 1 ; 1 Cor. i. 1 ; Rom. i. 1) are called, according to the promise of life which is in Christ Jesus (2 Tim. i. 1), to be witnesses of Christ (Acts i. 8) and of His resurrection (Acts iv. 33), as well as to preach the Gospel of God (Rom. i. 1), for the purpose of leading men to the true faith and the knowledge of the truth (Acts iii. 12-26 ; Tit. i. 1 ; 2 Tim. i. 9-11 ; cf. 1 Cor. v. 9 ; Ephes. iv. 15). As their immediate co-laborers are mentioned Timothy and Titus, besides several others (1 Tim. i. 2, 18 ; 2 Tim. i. 2 ; ii. 1 ; Tit. iv. 5), who are sometimes called the servants and ministers of the Lord (δοῦλοι καὶ διάκονοι κυρίου, 1 Tim. iii. 8, 12 ; 2 Tim. ii. 24 ; cf. 1 Cor. iii. 5 ; 2 Cor. vi. 4, 11, 23 ; Ephes. vi. 21 ; Col. i. 7 ; iv. 7 ; Phil. i. 1 ; 1 Thess. iii. 2). Consecrated to their office by the laying on of the hands of the Apostles and Presbytery (1 Tim. iv. 14 ; 2 Tim. i. 6 ; cf. Acts vi. 6 ; xiii. 3), they are to guide the Churches under their pastoral care by word and deed, by sound doctrine and good example (1 Tim. i. 3 ; 2 Tim. i. 13 ; Tit. i. 5 ; ii. 1). For this purpose they are furnished by the Apostle with special instructions : — 1.) in relation to the appointment of Elders and Bishops (Tit. i. 5) ; 2.) in relation to the treatment of Elders, widows, and young men (1 Tim. v. 1-22 ; Tit. ii. 2-17) ; 3.) in relation to family-government (1 Tim. ii. 9-15 ; v. 14 ; Tit. ii. 3, 4 ; cf. 1 Cor. xi. 8, 9 ; xiv. 33-36 ; 2 Cor. xi. 3) ; 4.) in relation to the rich (1 Tim. vi. 17, 18) ; 5.) in relation to servants or slaves (1 Tim. vi. 1 ; Tit. ii. 9, 10 ; cf. Ephes. vi. 5-8 ; Col. iii. 22-25) ; 6.) in relation to their preaching or teaching (1 Tim. i. 4, 18, 19 ; iv. 6-11 ; 2 Tim. i. 13 ; iv. 1, 2 ; Tit. ii. 1, 15) ; and, 7.) in relation to their own personal conduct (1 Tim. i. 18, 19 ; iv. 12-16 ; vi. 8-12 ; 2 Tim. ii. 3, 15, 16, 22 ; iii. 14 ; Tit. ii. 7).

But it is their special duty to give attention to sound doctrine (1 Tim. iv. 13-16 ; 2 Tim. iv. 2, 3 ; Tit. ii. 7). They are to preach the Word in season and out of season (2 Tim. iv. 2), and in the same spirit in which they received it (2 Tim. iii. 10, 11). Then they are to select faithful men, and, having instructed them in the doctrine of Christianity, ordain them Elders, to the end that they may be thus

prepared to teach others also¹ (2 Tim. ii. 2 ; Tit. i. 5), and thus propagate the Gospel from one generation to another. The Apostle regards aptitude to teach, that is, to preach, as a special and important qualification of an Elder (διδασκικόν, 1 Tim. 3), on which account such an one is worthy of double honor (1 Tim. v. 17). We are not, however, warranted to infer from this, as De Wette and Baur have done, that the Apostle made here a sharp distinction between *πρεσβύτεροι προσετώτες* and *πρεσβύτεροι κοπιῶντες ἐν λόγῳ καὶ διδασκαλίᾳ*. He was merely solicitous that, in view of the fact that heretical teachers had crept into, and would continue to creep into, the Churches, and that the duties of the Presbyters were becoming more numerous and onerous, the Pastors of the individual Churches should be mighty in word and deed, and so be able to instruct new converts, confirm them in their faith, comfort the sorrowful, and refute the heretical teachers. So, too, the detailed instructions as to the selection of proper persons for the various offices in the individual Churches owe their origin, no doubt, to the Apostle's anticipation, that sooner or later his personal superintendence over them would cease, and that they would thus be left to depend upon their own resources for their further growth and development.

OF THE OFFICERS OF THE CHURCH.

Apart from the Apostolic office, which was *sui generis*, the Pastoral Epistles mention *four* classes of officers in the Church, namely: 1. *Elders* or *Bishops* (*πρεσβύτεροι, ἐπίσκοποι*,² 1 Tim. iii. 1-6 ; v. 1, 17 ;

¹ Here we have an indication of the necessity of giving a theological training to those who are called to preach the Gospel. The Apostle, knowing that, sooner or later, teachers of false doctrines would creep into the Church (1 Tim. iv. 1-6), felt the importance and the necessity of such a measure. Hence he earnestly exhorts Timothy and Titus to constantly study the Scriptures (2 Tim. ii. 15 ; iii. 14-17), so that they might become (1) approved unto God, and (2) able workmen that need not be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth.

² There have been long and repeated controversies respecting the official meaning of *πρεσβύτερος* and *ἐπίσκοπος*, as found in the Apostolic Writings of the New Testament. Without wishing to reopen the controversy on this subject, we take the liberty to state some of the points which we regard as definitely settled:—

1. There is no authority in the New Testament for assuming that there is a difference, *as to orders*, between a *πρεσβύτερος* and an *ἐπίσκοπος*. 2. There is no authority in the New Testament for assuming that there was, in the Apostolic Church, a generic difference, *even as to the office*, between a *πρεσβύτερος* and an *ἐπίσκοπος*. 3. There is no indication in the New Testament that the *πρεσβύτεροι* and *ἐπίσκοποι* of the Apostolic Church displayed a *hierarchical* tendency, or that

Tit. i. 5-7); 2.) *Evangelists* (εὐαγγελισταί, 2 Tim. iv. 5; cf. Acts xxi. 8; Ephes. iv. 11); 3.) *Deacons* (διάκονοι, 1 Tim. iii. 8, 12; iv. 6); 4.) *Church Widows* (χήραι, 1 Tim. v. 3-16), or *Elderly Women* (πρεσβυτέραι or πρεσβύτιδες, 1 Tim. v. 2; Tit. ii. 3).

OF ELDERS OR BISHOPS.

Elders or Bishops, as well as Evangelists and Deacons, appear to have been constituted in the same manner. The ceremony of consecrating and inducting them into their respective offices consisted in fasting and prayer, and the imposition of hands either by the Apostles alone (2 Tim. i. 6; Acts vi. 6; xiv. 23), or by the Apostles and the Presbytery (1 Tim. iv. 14; 1 Pet. v. 1-5; the Apostles were also counted among the Elders, 1 Pet. v. 1), or by some invested by the Apostles with the authority to do so (Tit. i. 5).

The character and qualifications for their sacred office required of the Elders or Bishops, are more clearly indicated than their duties. They must be blameless; the husband of one wife (μίας γυναίκος ἄνδρα); vigilant; sober; peaceable; given to hospitality; not greedy of filthy lucre (αἰσχροκερδῆ); not covetous (ἀφιλάργυρον); not given to wine (μὴ πάροινον); must rule their own households well; having well-reported children; be no novices (νεόφυτοι); must have a good report of them which are without; and be apt to teach (διδακτικοί); so that they may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers.¹

any one among them assumed precedence before others. 4. The New Testament clearly indicates that πρεσβύτερος and ἐπίσκοπος were employed, in the Apostolic Church, as *synonymous* terms, both describing the *same order*, if not the *same office* (Phil. i. 1; 1 Tim. iii.; Tit. i. 5-7; Acts xx. 28; 1 Pet. ii. 25; v. 1-5), the one having reference to the *age* required for, and the *honor* connected with, the office, and the other to its *duties*. 5. Nor can it be proved from the New Testament, that the Apostles appointed successors in the Apostolic office, having the same authority and distinction as themselves. That office was *sui generis*, and was not to be perpetuated; nor could it be perpetuated, since one of the requirements of the Apostolic office was, that its incumbent must have seen and heard our Lord in person (Acts i. 21-26). Hence, for persons of any Church to claim that they are co-ordinate in rank and authority with the Apostles, is anti-scriptural.

¹ The peculiarity of the enumeration here given of the qualifications required of an Elder or Bishop has been urged by some critics as an objection against the genuineness of the Pastoral Epistles. That a candidate for such an office in the Church should possess such a character and such qualifications as are here specified, is so self-evident, it is urged, as to need no such specifications. But when the fact is taken into consideration, that improprieties, and even immoralities, had

Their duties appear to have been twofold: — 1.) The celebration and conduct of Divine worship, consisting in public and private prayers (Acts vi. 4), the ministry of the Word (Acts vi. 4), *i.e.*, preaching the Gospel and refuting gainsayers (Tit. i. 9); thus feeding and instructing the Church (Acts xx. 28); perfecting the saints, edifying the body (Church) of Christ, and improving the work of the ministry (Ephes. iv. 11, 12); in the administration of the Sacraments (Matt. xxviii. 29; Acts ii. 41, 42; 1 Cor. i. 14; xi. 23), and the visitation of the sick (Jam. v. 14). 2.) Church-government, or the administration of discipline, that is, the discharge of Episcopal func-

crept into the Apostolic Church (1 Cor. v. 1, 2; vi. 1-8; viii. 12; 2 Cor. ii. 7-13; xi. 13; xii. 20; Gal. iii. 1-3; v. 17; Tit. i. 10-16), to say nothing of what was prophesied would happen in this respect (1 Tim. vi. 1-3; 2 Tim. iii. 1-9), it is entirely in conformity with St. Paul's wisdom and forethought that he should instruct his sons in the Gospel, young and comparatively inexperienced as they were, that in the selection of men for the office of Elders or Bishops particular regard should be had as well to *their moral standing* in the churches and communities in which they were to labor, as to *their zealous adherence to and thorough knowledge of the Gospel doctrines*. Soundness in morals was then, as is now, as necessary to a successful spread of the Gospel as soundness in doctrine. With respect to the exact meaning of the words *μᾶς γυναῖκος ἄνδρα*, opinions vary. But the *grammatical* sense, whatever else may be supposed to be implied in the expression, is certainly the correct one; namely, that a *πρεσβύτερος* or *ἐπίσκοπος*, *should be married*, and be married to no more than *one* wife at the same time. The injunction is, therefore, directed: (1.) Against those who forbid marriage to the ordained clergy (1 Tim. iv. 3); and (2.) Against polygamy, and, no doubt, against concubinage. Both of these practices prevailed still, to some extent at least, during the Apostle's lifetime (see Josephus, *Antiquities*, xvii. 1. 13. 1; xviii. 1. 5. 1; Apostol. Const. viii. 32; Kitto's *Bibl. Cyclopædia*, Art. Marriage; Smith's *Dict. of Chr. Antiq.*, Art. Concubinage; *Lex. Jul. et Pap. Pop.*; cf. *Just. Mart. Dialog. c. Tryph.*); and might easily have been adopted by some Gentile Christians, especially in Crete, whose inhabitants seem to have been worse than people elsewhere (Tit. i. 12). That the expression is intended to forbid a second marriage in a presbyter or bishop after the death of the first wife seems an arbitrary inference. The simple requirement is, that at the time of his appointment he must be the husband of one wife, though, as far as any indication to the contrary is concerned, she may be his second wife after the death of the first. Neither Christ nor St. Paul forbid a second marriage in the ordinary sense. (See Matt. 22, 23-33; John iv. 16-20; Rom. v. 1-8; 1 Cor. vii. 7-39.) The legitimate inference from these passages seems to be, that the *moral* and *legal status* of the surviving party is the same it was before the first marriage, and hence he or she is at liberty to contract a new marriage. And since marriage is a divine, and, hence, a holy institution, the remark that abstinence from a second marriage indicates a purer or holier life and greater devotedness to the work of God, than it otherwise would be, is as inapplicable to a second as to a first marriage.

tions, for they were placed by the Holy Ghost *among*, not *over*, the flock as overseers (προσέχετε . . . παντὶ τῷ ποιμνίῳ; ἐν ᾧ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον ἔθετο ἐπισκόπους, Acts xx. 28; 1 Pet. v. 1-5; Tit. i. 5-7).

EVANGELISTS.

In connection with Elders, or Bishops, the Pastoral Epistles mention also *Evangelists* (εὐαγγελισταί, 2 Tim. iv. 5; cf. Acts xxi. 8; Ephes. iv. 11), who were either co-laborers with the Apostles, or, in a more general sense, teachers of Christianity. Though some of them were, no doubt, ordained Elders,—for the Apostle Paul exhorts Timothy, who was an Elder, “to do the work of an *Evangelist*,”—they were not stationary, that is, were not permanent pastors of individual Churches, but, under the direction of the Apostles, went from place to place to preach the Gospel, either by narrating the Gospel-history where it was still unknown,—thus preparing the way for the direct labors of the Apostles,—or, where Churches had been organized, by explaining more fully the doctrines of Christianity, until Pastors and Elders could be appointed from among themselves, thus also supplementing and continuing the labor of the Apostles. They were *itinerant* preachers in the truest sense of the word. The term “*Evangelist*” was applied to the authors of the Four Gospels at a much later period, and appears to signify the Historians of the Gospel rather than its Preachers.

DEACONS.

The Pastoral Epistles recognize the existence of the *office of Deacons*, but say nothing respecting its origin. The same may be said of the Epistle to the Philippians (i. 1). That it was instituted, under the influence of the Holy Spirit, by the Apostles, with the consent of the Mother-Church at Jerusalem (Acts vi. 1-6), and afterward introduced into the churches founded by the Apostles and their co-laborers, is, with some exceptions, generally assumed, and probably true.¹ That it was subordinate to that of Elders or Bishops, and constituted the lowest official grade, may be inferred from Acts vi. 1-6; Phil. i. 1; and 1 Tim. iii. 13; and that the post-Apostolic

¹ There can be no reasonable doubt that the word *Deacon* appears to have assumed its distinctive ecclesiastical meaning at the appointment of the “Seven” to superintend the distribution of the alms to the Hellenist widows (ἐν τῇ διακονίᾳ τῇ καθημερινῇ, Acts vi. 1-6), where the διακονία τῶν τραπέζων became distinct from the διακονία τοῦ λόγου. (See Art. *Deacon* in Smith & Cheetham’s Dict. of Chr. Antiq.).

Church in general considered the order of Deacons to have originated in the institution of "The Seven," is abundantly testified to by early Christian writers.¹

In reference to the *duties* of the deacons, we have no definite information in the Apostolic Writings, unless the duties prescribed for "*The Seven*" (Acts vi. 1-6) be regarded as such. So much may, however, be inferred, that they were primarily appointed for the purpose of "serving tables" at the *agapæ*, and distributing alms to the widows (Acts ii. 46 ; vi. 1-6) ; which duties were, no doubt, gradually enlarged to the dispensing of the charities of the Church in general ; to the management, under the Apostles and Elders, of its temporal affairs ; the seeking out and visiting the sick and afflicted ; and practising hospitality, especially to persecuted Christians. In short, their duties appear to have been comprehended in the *διακονία τῶν τραπέζων*, as distinguished from the *διακονία τοῦ λόγου*. Still, though *διδασκτικός* was a qualification not specifically required of them, they doubtless taught often in private, or were readers of the Scriptures (Old Testament and Apostolic Epistles) in public assemblies, and occasionally exhorted and preached ; for from among them Evangelists appear to have been chosen (Acts vi. 9, 10 ; vii. 1-53 ; viii. 5-8, 20-24 ; xxi. 8).² The possession, on their part, of special *χαρίσματα πνευματικά* would naturally lead, in the course of time, to a higher work and office, as was the case with Philip. For what else than ecclesiastical preferment did the Apostle Paul mean when he wrote, that those who use the "office of a deacon well, purchase to themselves a good degree" (*καλὸς βαθμὸς*) and "great boldness in faith" (*καὶ πολλὴν παρρησίαν ἐν πίστει τῇ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*), that is, great boldness in standing forth for the truth and against error (1 Tim. iii. 13) ? And why did he require in them substantially the *same moral qualifications* as in Elders or Bishops, if he had not in view their advancement to that office, whose incumbents were not to be *νεόφυτοι* (1 Tim. iii. 6) either in piety, or expe-

¹ *Vide* Iren. Hæres. i. 27 ; Sozom. Hist. Eccles. vii. 19 ; Const. Apost. viii. 46 ; St. Hilary, Comm. in 1 Tim. iii. 11, apud Ambrosii Opera ; Cyprian Epist. 65 ad Rogatian ; Id. Ep. 68 ad Pleb-Leg. ; Epiphani. Hæres. i. De Incarn. 4.

² The Philip mentioned in Acts viii. 5-8, 26-40, as "going down to the city of Samaria and *preaching* Christ unto them," *et seq.*, cannot possibly have been the Apostle Philip, as some have erroneously assumed, but the Philip mentioned in chapter vi. 5, who was originally appointed, with six others, for the *διακονία τῶν τραπέζων*, in the Church at Jerusalem. From this humble service he was promoted to the office of an Evangelist, in which he became successful.

rience, or knowledge, lest they become puffed up with stupid pride? And why else did he enjoin upon them to hold the *mystery of the faith* in a *pure conscience*, if not with a view to their ultimately preaching the Gospel as their regular vocation?

CHURCH-WIDOWS — DEACONESSSES.

A *fourth* class of ecclesiastical officers mentioned in the Pastoral Epistles — and in them only by name — are the “*Church-Widows*” (χήραι, 1 Tim. v. 2–16). These, together with the πρεσβύτεδες (Tit. ii. 3), and the πρεσβυτέραι (1 Tim. v. 2), and ἡ διάκονος (Rom. xvi. 1), were probably placed by the Apostle Paul in the same category. From the qualifications required of them it may be inferred that they constituted a class of female officers in the Apostolic Church, who appear to have performed duties in reference to their own sex analogous to those performed by the deacons among men. Their office in the Church was probably rendered necessary by the strict seclusion observed by the female sex in Oriental countries. Though it may not have been *exactly* the office of deaconess, as it appeared in a more developed and comprehensive form in the post-Apostolic Church, yet it was no doubt the beginning of it. This appears evident from two things: (1) from the required enrolment; there must have been a purpose in this other than merely to obtain a list of widows worthy of charity (χήρα καταλέγεσθω, 1 Tim. v. 9); (2) from the qualifications required of those whom Church-history bears us out in supposing that such an institution had already been long in existence at the close of the second century, and that it was universally traced back to the Apostolic arrangement as described in these Epistles.¹

With respect to the qualifications the Apostle required of the candidates for this office, it may be observed, that here, as elsewhere, he displayed great wisdom and forethought. The candidates were to be chosen from among widows (χήραι) over sixty years of age, having been the wife of one husband, well reported for good works, *et seq.* A good age insured, generally, experience, wisdom, stability of character, and steadiness of purpose. Having been the wife of one husband, — whatever this may mean, — enabled her to teach the

¹ *Visd.* Tertull. de Vell. Virg., c.q.; Clem. Alex., Strom. iii.; Constit. Apost., iii. 15, 16; ii. 26; Epiphan., Expos. Fid., c. xxi.; Neander's History of the Planting, etc., sub. *Deac.*; Schaff's History of the Apostolic Church, sub. *Deac.*; Guericke's Handbuch der Kirchen-Geschichte, pp. 107, 108; Herzog & Plitt's Real Encycl., sub. *Diakonissin*.

younger women domestic virtues (Tit. ii. 3-5), and to exert a salutary influence over them; and having followed good works, secured for her a public recognition of being a trustworthy and godly person. Now, if nothing more than ordinary membership, and that of a class needing charity, was had in view, it would be difficult to understand all the qualifications here required of them. On the other hand, it is in perfect harmony with the spirit of Paul's teachings and practice to establish a holy relation between the humblest and the Church. He desired the service of all for the upbuilding and strengthening of the Church. Hence the widow was far better adapted for the office of deaconess than the unmarried woman; for she had experience of human life; she knew its great sorrows, and her position gave her a special fitness for administering consolation. The fact that the rule, as to age, was, in the post-Apostolic Church, so far modified as to permit *virgins* to be appointed to that office¹ is a strong proof against the post-Apostolic origin of the Pastoral Epistles, as maintained by Dr. Baur.²

We flatter ourselves that the preceding observations will lead intelligent and unbiassed minds to acknowledge that the conception of the Church and its Constitution, as unfolded in the Pastoral Epistles, bears the stamp of St. Paul's mind, and is in perfect harmony with his other writings. "Nowhere in his Epistles do we find traces of an *hierarchical* establishment, but only the broad outlines and essential features of a Church Constitution. According to him, the Christian Church is realized or embodied in the particular Churches. These, in his time, he formed into separate organizations, but on the same substantial basis. They were united among themselves, but the bond of union was a purely spiritual one; it was never a chain. Neither did he nor they appeal in any matter to the authority of the Church as a whole. At the time he wrote these Epistles there were no general and periodical assemblies for the purpose of deciding questions that might be referred to them. The so-called Council at Jerusalem did not issue anything like positive decrees; it confined itself simply to recommending a compromise."³ Hence the objection that the Pastoral Epistles presuppose the existence of a well-designed Church Constitution, such as we find in the second and third centuries, falls to the ground. The objectors

¹ *Vide* Tertull., de Vel. Virg., c.q.

² *Vide* Baur's "Paulus," Part II. Chap. IX.

³ *Vide* Pressense's Early Years of Christianity, II. 5.

put something into these Epistles which is not found there and does not belong there.

III. We come now to consider, briefly, *a third peculiarity of the Pastoral Epistles*, namely, *the Heresy alluded to, or warned against, therein*. Dr. Baur maintains that the heresy therein refuted, belongs to the Gnosticism of the second century. Hence, he argues, these Epistles cannot have been written by the Apostle Paul, but by a pseudo-Paul, who lived during that century. This criticism, supported as it is by a great show of learning, has called forth voluminous discussions on both sides of the question. It would carry us far beyond the scope of this article, were we to attempt to give a history of these discussions. We shall simply indicate the main results obtained. That the author of these Epistles had in view certain heretics (*αἵρετικοὶ ἄνθρωποι*, Tit. iii. 10), by whom the Christians were in danger of being led astray, and that many of his statements were directed against them, cannot be called in question. But it is by no means clearly made out, that their erroneous doctrines belonged to the Gnosticism of the second century. Far from containing a complete description of it, the Pastoral Epistles give us only the general features, entirely unconnected among themselves, of a heresy, the nascent elements of which, according to Dr. Baur's own showing in his work on the Christian Gnosis (pp. 34-40), were already in existence among the Jews before the time of Christ. To find more than this in these Epistles is to find something which in reality is not there. It may, perhaps, be proper to give here, in a somewhat connected form, the delineation, as found in them, of the character of the heretics mentioned therein, in order that the reader may judge for himself whether it has been proved beyond successful contradiction, that their tenets are none other than those of the Gnostics of the second century, with which history acquaints us.

In the *First Epistle* Timothy is warned against those who have turned away from a pure heart, a good conscience, and unfeigned faith (*ἐκ καθαρᾶς καρδίας καὶ συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς καὶ πίστεως ἀνυποκρίτου*, i. 5, 6), and concerning faith have made shipwreck (*περὶ τὴν πίστιν ἐνανάγησαν*, i. 19), and who, being destitute of the truth (*ἀπειστερημένων τῆς ἀληθείας*, vi. 5), and not holding to the wholesome words of the Lord Jesus Christ (*ὑγαίνουσι λόγους τοῖς Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, vi. 3), are morally corrupt (*διεφθαρμένοι τὸν νοῦν*, vi. 5), proud, and boast of the possession of special (but pseudo-) knowledge (*τῆς ψευδονύμου γνώσεως*, vi. 20), which they desire to communicate in the form

of certain heterodox doctrines (*ἐτεροδιδασκαλεῖν*, i. 3). But their doctrines being mainly doctrines of devils (*διδασκαλαὶ δαιμονίων*, iv. 1), consist only in vain jangling (*ματαιολογία*, i. 6) and profane and vain babblings (*βέβηλοι κενοφωναί*, vi. 20) about old wives' fables (*βέβηλοι καὶ γραῶδεις μῦθοι*, i. 4; iv. 7) and endless genealogies (*γενεαλογίαν ἀπέραντοι*, i. 4), causing questions and strifes of words, for which they have a vicious fondness (*νοσῶν περὶ ζητήσεις καὶ λογομαχίας*, vi. 4). They desire to be teachers of the law without understanding its real meaning (*θύλοντες εἶναι νομοδιδάσκαλοι*, i. 7), enjoining arbitrary commandments, which prohibit marriage and the use of meats which God has created (. . . *κωλύοντες γαμεῖν, ἀπέχεσθαι βρωμάτων*, iv. 3). By their seemingly ascetic life they seek to gain the reputation of being very pious, making godliness the means of obtaining worldly gain (*νομίζοντες πορισμὸν εἶναι τὴν εὐσέβειαν*, vi. 5), but having at the same time their conscience seared as with a hot iron (*κεκαυτηριασμένων τὴν ἰδίαν συνείδησιν*, iv. 2).

In the *Second Epistle* to Timothy the heretics are described as in the First Epistle, as being persons who, having fallen from the faith and turned away from the truth (*περὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἡστόχησαν*, ii. 18; ii. 25; iii. 8), and being morally corrupt (*ἄνθρωποι κατεφθαρμένοι τὸν νοῦν*, iii. 8; *πονηροὶ ἄνθρωποι*, iii. 13), are in the snare of the devil (*τοῦ διαβόλου παγίδος*, ii. 26). They have the form of godliness, but by their being boasters, covetous, proud, blasphemers, disobedient, unthankful, unholy, incontinent, fierce, etc., etc. (*φιλάργυροι, ἀλαζόντες, ὑπερήφανοι, βλάσφημοι, γονεῦσιν ἀπειθεῖς, ἀχάριστοι, ἀνόσιοι, ἄστοργοι, ἄσπονδοι, διάβολοι, ἀκρατεῖς, ἀνήμεροι, ἀφιλάγαθοι*, etc., iii. 1-7), they deny the power thereof, and hence will not endure sound doctrine, iv. 3). They secretly endeavor to propagate their tenets, consisting in profane and vain babblings and foolish and unlearned questions (ii. 16, 23) by creeping into houses, insinuating themselves into the good graces of silly women laden with sins, and, by perverting the truth, leading them into still greater sins (iii. 6-8). Among such classes of persons their word — namely, the perversion of truth, such as the declaration that the resurrection is past already — eats as doth a canker (ii. 17, 18), and thereby undermines their faith.

In the *Epistle to Titus* the heretics, or gainsayers (*ἀντιλέγοντες*, i. 9), are represented as belonging mostly to the Jews (*μάλιστα οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς*, i. 10). While pretending to possess a special knowledge of God, they lead a godless and abominable life (*βδελυκτοὶ ὄντες καὶ ἀπειθεῖς*, i. 16), and thus defile their conscience, and are being condemned by it (i. 15; iii. 11). The contents of their teachings consist

in Jewish fables (Ἰουδαϊκοῖς μύθοις, i. 14), genealogies and foolish questions about the law (μωρὰς δὲ ζητήσεις καὶ γενεαλογίας καὶ ἔρεις καὶ μάχας νομικὰς, iii. 9), and mere commandments of men that turn the hearers from the truth (ἐντολαὶ ἀνθρώπων ἀποστρεφόμενων τὴν ἀλήθειαν, i. 14). They are vain talkers (ματαιολόγοι, i. 10), teaching what is unseemly (διδάσκοντες ἃ μὴ δεῖ, i. 11), and as deceivers (φρεναπάται, i. 10), causing heretical schisms in the Church (αἵρετικοὶ ἄνθρωποι, iii. 10), and all this for filthy lucre's sake (αἰσχροῦ κέρδους χάριν, i. 11).

From the preceding delineation it is evident that the author of the Pastoral Epistles had, in the main, one and the same heresy in view. The attempt to resolve it into *four*,¹ or at least into *three*² distinct classes, is now regarded as a total failure, and is, therefore, to be dismissed without further consideration. Nor are we left in the dark as to the nature and tendency of this heresy. True, the views on this point differ widely, and yet it is not so difficult, as it may at first sight appear, to gather from the mass of conflicting opinions a tolerably correct idea of its character. Its predominant element is that of an ascetic Judaism. It is not, however, of the same type as the Judaism which the Apostle opposes in other writings of his,—the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians, for instance.—It was, no doubt, a kind of Essene-Judaism, ascetic in its tendency, that had “become enamored of and wedded to Oriental mysticism.”³ Ephesus, and, indeed, most provinces of Proconsular Asia, had become centres of religious and speculative thought. Would it not, therefore, be strange, if the kind of Judaism referred to, had entirely escaped these influences? Indeed, there can be no question about the fact that this Oriental theosophic mysticism had a large share in producing the false doctrines (ἑτεροδιδασκαλίαι, 1 Tim. i. 3; vi. 3) denounced in the Pastoral Epistles and in the Epistle to the Colossians. It appears that false teachers (ἑτεροδιδάσκαλοι), mostly from among the Jews (μάλιστα οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς, Tit. i. 10), infected with this strange medley of Essene-Judaism and pagan notions, had succeeded in creeping into the Christian Churches at Ephesus, Colosse, and Crete, and, by boasting of a φιλοσοφία, which the Apostle stigmatizes as “vain deceit” (κενὴ ἀπάτη, Col. ii. 8) and “science falsely so called” (γνώσις ψευδώνυμος, 1 Tim. vi. 20), in undermining the

¹ Credner: Einleitung in das Neue Testament.

² Thiersch: Versuch zur Herstellung, etc., pp. 236, 273.

³ Prof. (now Bishop) Lightfoot: St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and Philemon, where the subject is fully discussed on pages 73-113.

faith of some members in the simple truth of the Gospel, and thereby causing them concerning the faith to make shipwreck. That these false teachers were mostly Jews, is evident, first, from the expression, *μάλιστα οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς* (Tit. i. 10), and, second, from the fact that they desired to be teachers of the law (*θέλοντες εἶναι νομοδιδάσκαλοι*, 1 Tim. i. 7), pretending to have derived their doctrines from Jewish *tradition* (*παράδοσιν*, Col. ii. 8, *i.e.*, Ἰουδαϊκοὶ μύθοι, Tit. i. 14) as well as from the (recorded) *genealogies* (*γενεαλογίαι*, 1 Tim. i. 4), the spiritual significance or allegorical interpretation of which were spun out *endlessly*, thus making them virtually *ἀπέραντοι* (1 Tim. i. 4).¹ Is it to be wondered at, that this indulging in subtle inquiries concerning the *γενεαλογίαι* and Ἰουδαϊκοὶ μύθοι should provoke discussions that had the characteristics of *βέβηλοι κενοφωνίαι καὶ γραῦδεις μύθοι*, of which St. Paul warns Timothy? Nor should it be overlooked, that these heretical speculations — *ἑτεροδιδασκαλαί* — frequently led to practical extremes: either to rigid asceticism, forbidding marriage and the use of meats which God hath created (1 Tim. iv. 3), or to unbridled license, putting away a good conscience (1 Tim. i. 19), and loving pleasure more than God (2 Tim. iii. 3). The predominance of the one or the other of these extremes was no doubt owing to the predominance of the one or the other of the speculative elements in the hybrid union of Essene-Judaism and Oriental theosophic mysticism.

¹ "This is the meaning we attach to the words *γενεαλογίαι ἀπέραντοι*. Some have supposed the reference to be to the *Genealogies of the Eons* in the system of Emanations; but this would infer a system of Gnosticism much more advanced than that here described (if it be a system at all). Marigold shows that the word *genealogy* has never been taken in this sense in the Gnostic systems. He quotes, after Dachne, a passage from Philo, which justifies the interpretation we have given. Philo, in fact, after dividing the Pentateuch into two parts, — the first comprising the laws and ordinances, the second the historical documents, — makes under the latter head two further subdivisions, the historical, properly so called, and the *genealogical* portion: — Ἔστιν οὖν τοῦ ἱστορικοῦ, τὸ μὲν περὶ τῆς τοῦ κοσμοῦ γενέσεως, τὸ δὲ γενεαλογικόν· τοῦ δὲ γενεαλογικοῦ, τὸ μὲν περὶ κολάσεως ἀσεβῶν, τὸ δὲ αὖ περὶ τιμῆς δικαίων — 'Of the genealogies one portion refers to the punishment of the wicked, the other to the rewards of the righteous.' (Philo, *De Vita Contemplativa*, a. o. θ. § 4.) Thus, the genealogies, according to him, were to show the punishment of the wicked and the recompense of the just. It is evident that they can do this only under an allegorical system of interpretation. Now, it is known, that Philo found in the genealogies a complete psychology. The names represented to him the conditions of the soul (*τρόποι τῆς ψυχῆς*). It is easy to imagine what important results the party of Judaizing heretics might derive from the innumerable genealogies of the Old Testament." — Pressense, *The Early Years of Christianity*, pp. 287, 288.

Now, if this union of Essene-Judaism and Oriental theosophic mysticism was *Gnostic* in its character,—and we readily admit that it was,—*there is no evidence whatever that it points to a period posterior to that of the Apostles*, that is, that it is the Gnosticism of the second century. Indeed, it has been fully proved by Bishop Lightfoot, in his “Dissertation on the Colossian Heresy,”¹ that Gnosticism was not necessarily an offspring of Christianity, but a direction of religious speculation which existed independently of it, and that in its leading features it had already established itself in the Apostolic age, especially in those parts of Asia Minor (Ephesus and Crete), with which our Epistles are concerned. If this be true, there can be no doubt that Christianity, coming into contact with it, would naturally arouse it to unwonted activity by leading men to dwell more earnestly on various philosophico-theological questions, and thus, after a comparatively short time, this Gnosticism would absorb into its system more or fewer Christian elements, or Christianity in some of its forms would receive a tinge from Gnosticism.

The conclusion to which our brief enquiry has brought us is this : The Pastoral Epistles combat a heresy composed of speculative and ethical elements both of Essene-Judaism and Oriental theosophic mysticism, from which it received a Gnostic tinge ; a heresy which existed already in the Apostolic age, not, indeed, in a completely developed system, but only in its incipient stages. When, therefore, such theologians as Neander, Rothe, Matthies, Bleek, Wiesinger, Baumgarten, Böttger, Gurricke, Van Oosterzee, Conybeare and Howson, Huther, Lightfoot, Whedon, Schaff, and others, have not only not been convinced of the justness of Dr. Baur’s criticisms and conclusions, supported as they are by the most comprehensive learning, that the Pastoral Epistles deal with the Gnosticism of the second century, but point more or less to this, that the “germ of the Judaizing Gnosticism, or a Judaizing theosophico-ascetical tendency, such as shows itself in the two Epistles to Timothy (and in that of Titus), must *à priori* be presupposed as existing at this period (that is, in the Apostolic age), as the heresies of the second century point back to such a tendency evolving itself out of Judaism” (Neander) — it may well be assumed that his (Baur’s) theory is no longer tenable, and that, consequently, the Apostolic authorship of the Pastoral Epistles is fully established.

¹ Lightfoot, *The Epistles of St. Paul to the Colossians and to Philemon*, pp. 73–113.

IV. We turn now to a brief consideration of the *Linguistic Peculiarities* of the Pastoral Epistles.

An argument against their genuineness has been drawn from what is alleged to be peculiar and un-Pauline in their style, especially in regard to the new words and phrases with which they abound. Schleiermacher was the first one to begin this philological argument, but he confined it to the First Epistle to Timothy.¹ De Wette's criticism is particularly full on this point, extending it to the three Epistles.² Equally full are Prof. Holtzmann's investigations in reference to this particular argument against their Pauline origin.³ Now, it is true that an unusual number of new and rare words, compounds, and phrases occur therein, which are not found elsewhere in the New Testament, nor even in Greek literature. But the same thing may be affirmed of the other Pauline Epistles, only perhaps in a less degree. A brief comparison will show this. Thus, the number of *ἄπαξ λεγόμενα* are: In 1 Timothy, *eighty-one* (of which the following are examples: *διώκτης*, i. 13; *ὑπερπλεονάζω*, i. 14; *ἀποδοχή*, i. 15; iv. 9; *ναυαγέω*, i. 19; *ἐντεινέεις*, ii. 1; iv. 5; *ἡρεμος*, ii. 2; *ἀποδεκτός*, ii. 3; *ἀντίλυτρον*, ii. 6; *κόσμος*, ii. 9; iii. 2; *θεοσέβεια*, ii. 10; *τεκνογονία*, ii. 15; v. 10; *δίλογος*, iii. 8; *βαθμός*, iii. 13; *ὁμολογουμένως*, iii. 16; *ψευδολόγος*, iv. 2; *μετάληψις*, iv. 3; *ἐπιπλήσσω*, v. 1; *ἀμοιβή*, v. 4; *καταλέγω*, v. 9; *καταστρηγιάζω*, v. 11; *φλύαρος*, v. 13; *περίεργος*, v. 13; *οἰκοδοσποτέω*, v. 14; *πρόκριμα*, v. 21; *πρόσκλησις*, v. 21; *ὑπόνοια*, vi. 4; *ἀδηλότης*, vi. 17, etc.); in 2 Timothy, *sixty-three* (such as: *ἀναζωπυρέω*, i. 6; *ἀναψύχω*, i. 16; *δίδωμι ἔλεος*, i. 16; *εὐρίσκω ἔλεος*, i. 18; *πραγματεία*, ii. 4; *στρατολογέω*, ii. 4; *ἄθλέω*, ii. 5; *χρήσιμος*, ii. 14; *ἀνεπαίσχυντος*, ii. 15; *ὀρθοτομέω*, ii. 15; *νεωτερικός*, ii. 22; *ἀνεξίκακος*, ii. 24; *ἀντιδιατιθέμενος*, ii. 25; *ἀνανήφω*, ii. 26; *φίλαντος*, iii. 2; *ἀνήμερος*, iii. 3; *φιλήδονος*, iii. 4; *φιλόθεος*, iii. 4; *ἔκδηλος*, iii. 9; *ἀγωγή*, iii. 10; *γότης*, iii. 13; *θεόπνευστος*, iii. 16; *ἐπισωρεύω*, iv. 3; *κνήθω*, iv. 3, etc.); and in Titus, *forty-four* (such as: *ἁψευδής*, i. 2; *ὀργίλος*, i. 7; *ἐγκρατής*, i. 8; *φρεναπάτης*, i. 10; *βδελυκτός*, i. 16; *ἱεροπρεπής*, ii. 3; *φίλανδρος*, ii. 4; *φιλότεκνος*, ii. 4; *ἀκατάγνωστος*, ii. 8; *κοσμικὰς*, ii. 12; (also in Hebr. xi. 1); *περιούσιος*, ii. 14; *φιλανθρωπία*, iii. 4; *φροντίζω*, iii. 8; *αἵρετικός*, iii. 10, etc.). In the Epistle to the Galatians there are more than *fifty-seven*; in that to the Philippians,

¹ Schleiermacher, Ueber den Sogen. Ersten Brief an Timotheus.

² De Wette, Lehrbuch der Histor.-Krit. Einleitung in die Kanon. Schriften des Neuen Testaments, *in loco*.

³ Holtzmann, Die Pastoral-Briefe Kritisch und Exegetisch Behandelt, *in loco*.

fifty-four; and in those to the Ephesians and Colossians, together about *one hundred and forty*. While, then, the existence of such ἀπαξ λεγόμενα¹ in the Pastoral Epistles is fully admitted, we are by no means justified in drawing therefrom an argument of any evidential value against their Pauline origin; otherwise, by the same process, the genuineness of every one of St. Paul's Epistles might be impugned. If, then, we find in his Epistles addressed to different churches an abundant supply of new words not before used by him, how much more natural is this in the Pastoral Epistles, addressed, as they are, to individuals who are co-laborers with and under him! How true is the following:—

“May we not expect, *à priori*, that in these Epistles a new class of words will appear, when we find this in every one even of the Epistles that are otherwise homogeneous? Of still greater importance, however, is another circumstance to be noticed here. These Epistles, as the criticism to which we are opposed is wont most to insist upon, bring before us, in detail, forms of the religious life altogether new, and errors the like of which do not occur in the other Epistles. These new things, if they are to be called by their names, must, of necessity, give rise to new designations. And if now these Epistles treat of the institutions of the Church, and contain directions to Titus and Timothy for the right management of the affairs of the Church,—topics which we find handled in none of the other Epistles,—how could it be otherwise than that new expressions should occur in connection with these subjects? Besides, if these Epistles collectively belong to a later period (in St. Paul's life) than all the rest, and pretty nearly to the same period, what ground is there, *à priori*, for surprise at finding that they are closely related to each other, and differ considerably from the rest, especially as they all refer to matters which till then were unknown? There is, then, no reason for our being perplexed by the occurrence of new expressions and formulas”!²

¹ According to Holtzmann they contain 897 words; among these there are 169 “hapaxlegomena,” not found in the New Testament, namely: 74 in First Timothy, 46 in Second Timothy, 28 in Titus (quoted nearly as above), and 21 common to two or three Past. Epistles. Canon Farrar, in the second volume of his “Life and Work of St. Paul,” p. 611, states that there are no less than 111 peculiar terms in Romans, 186 in Corinthians, 57 in Galatians, 54 in Philippians, and 6 in Philemon. According to Holtzmann, *Luke* is especially rich in a peculiar vocabulary; he has 34 words in common with the Past. Epist., and has, besides, 82 words not found in St. Paul's writings.

² Wiesinger's Commentary to St. Paul's Epistles to the Philippians, Titus, and 1 Timothy; General Introduction, p. 329, Edinburgh Translation.

Again, the very peculiarity found in the construction of sentences and periods indicate the mind of the Apostle Paul in all its versatility and fertility of resources. While in his other Epistles the sentences are often involved and obscure, the thoughts in their fulness and profundity struggling, as it were, for adequate expressions, the style of the Pastoral Epistles is mostly smooth and flowing, seldom, if ever, losing itself in long periods and participial constructions, or showing *aposiopeses* or abruptly broken-off sentences. In this respect these Epistles belong to the most lucid and easily understood writings of the New Testament. They contain few such serious grammatical and rhetorical difficulties as are found, for example, in the Epistles to the Romans, Galatians, and Ephesians. And yet this difference is explainable by the difference of the subject-matter discussed in the two classes of Epistles. For it is of the utmost importance to the form in which thoughts are clothed, whether the subject-matter under discussion relates to the councils and revelations of God, or to personal and ecclesiastical affairs. Thus, a close study of the Pastoral Epistles will reveal the fact that whenever the Apostle discusses dogmatic questions, his language shows a leaning toward long and involved sentences. (Comp. 1 Tim. i. 8-12; vi. 13-16; 2 Tim. i. 8-12; Titus ii. 11-14; iii. 3-7.)

There is, therefore, no warrant whatever for the conclusion that the *linguistic peculiarities* of the Pastoral Epistles form an evidence against their Pauline origin; the less so, since a comparison with them of similar expressions taken from some of his other Epistles will show, in the main, an agreement in thought, such as might be expected from a mind of such wonderful fertility as that of the Apostle Paul. To illustrate this remark, let us compare the following expressions:—

1 Tim. ii. 11, 12.

Γυνή ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ μανθανέτω ἐν πάσῃ ὑποταγῇ· γυναικί δὲ διδάσκειν οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω, οὐδὲ αὐθεντεῖν ἀνδρός, ἀλλ' εἶναι ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ.

1 Tim. ii. 13.

Ἀδὰμ γὰρ πρῶτος ἐπλάσθη, εἴτα Εὔα.

1 Cor. xiv. 34.

Αἱ γυναῖκες ὑμῶν ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις σιγάτωσαν· οὐ γὰρ ἐπιτρέπεται¹ αὐταῖς λαλεῖν, ἀλλ' ὑποτάσσασθαι.

1 Cor. xi. 8, 9.

Οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν ἀνὴρ ἐκ γυναικός, ἀλλὰ γυνή ἐξ ἀνδρός· καὶ γὰρ οὐκ ἐκτίσθη ἀνὴρ διὰ τὴν γυναῖκα, ἀλλὰ γυνή διὰ τὸν ἄνδρα.

¹ Tischendorf, Tregelles, Westcott and Hort use the word *ἐπιτρέπεται*, instead of *ἐπιτέρεται* of the *Textus Receptus*.

2 Tim. i. 3, 4.

Χάριν ἔχω τῷ θεῷ . . . ὡς ἀδιάλειπτον
ἔχω τὴν περὶ σοῦ μνείαν ἐν ταῖς δεήσεσίν
μου νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας, ἐπιποθῶν σε ἰδεῖν.

2 Tim. ii. 5.

Ἐὰν δὲ καὶ ἀθλῇ τις, οὐ στεφανοῦται,
ἐὰν μὴ νομίμως ἀθλήσῃ.

2 Tim. ii. 6.

Τὸν κοπιῶντα γεωργὸν δεῖ πρῶτον τῶν
καρπῶν μεταλαμβάνειν.

2 Tim. ii. 11.

Εἰ γὰρ συναπεθάνομεν, καὶ συζήσομεν.

2 Tim. ii. 20.

Ἐν μεγάλῃ δὲ οἰκίᾳ . . . ἔστι σκεύη
. . . ἃ μὲν εἰς τιμὴν, ἃ δὲ εἰς ἀτιμίαν.

2 Tim. iii. 2-4.

. . . φίλαντοι, φιλόργυροι, ἀλάζονες,
ὑπερήφανοι, βλάσφημοι, γονεῦσιν ἀπει-
θεῖς, ἄστοργοι, ἄστονδοι, διδάβοι . . .
τετυφωμένοι.

Rom. i. 8, 11.

. . . εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ μου . . . ὡς
ἀδιαλείπτως μνείαν ὑμῶν ποιῶμαι, πάν-
τοτε ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν μου δεόμενος . . .
ἐπιποθῶ γὰρ ἰδεῖν ὑμᾶς.

1 Cor. ix. 24.

Οὐκ οἶδατε, ὅτι οἱ ἐν σταδίῳ τρέχοντες
πάντες μὲν τρέχουσιν, εἷς δὲ λαμβάνει τὸ
βραβεῖον.

1 Cor. ix. 7.

Τίς φυτεῖει ἀμπελῶνα καὶ τὸν καρπὸν
οὐκ ἐσθίει:

Rom. vi. 8.

Εἰ δὲ ἀπεθάνομεν σὺν Χριστῷ πιστεύ-
ομεν, ὅτι καὶ συζήσομεν αὐτῷ.

Rom. ix. 21.

*Ἡ οὐκ ἔχει ἐξουσίαν ὁ κεραμεὺς τοῦ
πηλοῦ, ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ φυράματος ποιῆσαι ὃ
μὲν εἰς τιμὴν σκεῦος, ὃ δὲ εἰς ἀτιμίαν:

Rom. i. 29-31.

. . . πεπληρωμένους πάσῃ ἀδικίᾳ, πονη-
ρίᾳ, πλεονεξίᾳ, κακίᾳ . . . ψίθυριστάς,
καταδάλους . . . ὑβριστάς, ὑπερηφάνους
. . . γονεῦσιν, ἀπειθεῖς, ἀσυνέτους, ἀσυν-
θέτους, ἀστόργους, ἀνελεήμονας.¹

Compare also 1 Tim. i. 12-14 with 1 Cor. xv. 9, 10; 2 Tim. ii. 8 with Rom. i. 3; 2 Tim. iv. 6 with Phil. ii. 17; Titus i. 1-4 with Rom. i. 1-6, etc.²

Now, the similarity of language and thought in the preceding quotations is certainly not the result of the plagiarism of a pseudo-Paul, but rather of the association of ideas. A pseudo-Paul, desiring to palm off his literary productions as genuine Pauline writings, would have spread his colors more glaringly. He would, no doubt, have copied the linguistic peculiarities of the other Pauline Epistles, and striven to give his productions a Pauline character, thus making a sad botch of his work. But the Pastoral Epistles show no traces of pla-

¹ Vide article on Pastoral Epistles, by Mr. Steiwenden, in February number of "Beweis des Glaubens," 1875.

² We fully admit difficulties in the Pastoral Epistles that are inexplicable for want of knowledge of the situation of the author; but certainly the philological argument tends rather to establish their genuineness than the contrary; and so do the heretical, Church-institutional, and doctrinal arguments.

giarism or of patch-work. They bear the impress of Paul's mind; and the deviation of their style from that of his other Epistles is explainable by the essential difference of the situations in which he wrote the two classes of Epistles. Nor is it at all surprising that he should have used in them, occasionally, similar thoughts and expressions. Where is the orator or author who, in a long and laborious life, does not occasionally repeat himself? Hence, the similarity in thought and expression in the above compared quotations, far from impugning the genuineness of the Pastoral Epistles, is really an evidence in favor of their Pauline origin.

Again: we meet in these Epistles formations and combinations of words found in his other Epistles. Thus, the combination of the preposition *ἐπὲρ* with verbs and other words to intensify their meaning, is of frequent occurrence in all his Epistles. Take, for example, the following: — *ὑπερπλεονάζειν*, 1 Tim. i. 14; *ὑπεραυξάνειν*, 2 Thess. i. 3; *ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ*, Ephes. iii. 20; *ὑπὲρ λάν*, 2 Cor. xi. 5; *ὑπερπερισσεύειν*, Rom. v. 20. So, too, we meet with the same or similar words and phrases, as, for example: *ἐναγγέλιον . . . ὃ ἐπιστεύθη ἐγώ*, 1 Tim. i. 11; Tit. i. 3; Gal. ii. 7; 1 Thess. ii. 4; *πιστόν με ἡγήσατο*, 1 Tim. i. 12; = *ἡλεημένος ὑπὸ κυρίου πιστός*, 1 Cor. vii. 25; *καλὸς ὁ νόμος*, 1 Tim. i. 8; = *ὁ νόμος ἅγιος*, Rom. vii. 12; *δυνατὸς ὁ θεός*, 2 Tim. i. 12; Rom. xi. 23; and many more.

We bring our brief investigation to a close. It is possible that a more critical scholar may consider some of the reasons adduced in favor of the genuineness of the Pastoral Epistles unable to stand his test; but it seems to me that unprejudiced students must acknowledge that the problem of their genuineness finds an easier and more natural solution in the way we have briefly indicated, than in that pursued by the negative critics. We have omitted to discuss the questions concerning the *time when* and the *place where* they were written, for the reason that they belong to their *external* history rather than to their *internal* peculiarities.

In conclusion, we may be allowed to state that the *external* testimonies in favor of their genuineness possess almost a cumulative force. In this respect they belong to the most favored of St. Paul's Epistles. Though they have been subjected to the severest criticism and the keenest scrutiny, they have come forth unscathed, and "made the prejudiced confess their truth and feel their power." They "now live, and so brightly and forever shine."